ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

MANAGEMENT RESEARCH THAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE: BROADENING THE MEANING OF IMPACT

[1] Mr. Subrat Choudhury, [2] Ms. Rasmita Prusty
[1]Assistant Professor, Raajdhani Engineering College, Odisha, Bhubaneswar, India
[2]Assistant Professor, Raajdhani Engineering College, Odisha, Bhubaneswar, India

ABSTRACT
The world is undergoing dramatic transformations. Many of the grand societal chal-lenges we currently face underscore the need for scholarly research – including management studies – that can help us best sort out and solve them. Yet, management scholars struggle to produce concrete solutions or to communicate how their research can help to tackle these grand societal challenges. With this editorial, we want to help scholars seeking to 'make a difference' by broadening our understanding of what constitutes impactful research. We examine five forms of impact – *scholarly*, *practical*, *societal*, *policy*, and *educational* – outlining how scholars can systematically extend or enlarge their research agenda or projects to amplify their impact on the challenges societies face. We suggest that each of these forms of impact has intrinsic value in advancing the scientific enterprise and, together, can help to address key societal problems that reach beyond the immediate and traditional context of business management. With concrete suggestions for getting started on these forms of impact, and possible outputs for each, we hope to stimulate management and organization scholars to think more broadly about the opportunities for making an impact with their research and to begin doing so more often.

Keywords: grand challenges, impact, managements studies, relevance, social impact, societal issues

INTRODUCTION

The world as we know it is undergoing dramatic transformations. For many years, we have been living in a period of constant turmoil – what some have termed non-ergo-dic change – with one grand challenge or crisis following and compounding the next. Among these are the global refugee crisis, the financial crisis, the climate crisis, the crisis of critical consciousness (e.g., #MeToo and Black Lives Matter movements), and, most prominently at the time of this writing, the worldwide COVID-19 crisis. Particularly during crises, societies turn to science – including social science – for explanations, solutions, and a way forward. At the same time, the scientific enterprise itself has been called into question, with politicians, the media, and the broader public challenging the scientific community to demonstrate the impact of academic research beyond the proverbial ivory tower, and asking how it can help understand and
influence how people and organizations think, behave, or perform. These developments are especially salient for universities characterized as servants of the public that should produce knowledge for the greater good.

For these reasons, the ability to valorise research findings has become an important assessment indicator, not only in requests for funding and in achieving accreditation but also in merit evaluations, promotion decisions, and other assessments. Most scholars in academic or popular conversations have been asked: 'What is the impact of your re-search?'. In fact, management scholars have repeatedly been challenged to explain the impact of their research based on practical relevance and social usefulness (e.g., Aguinis et al., 2019; Bartunek and Rynes, 2010; Davis and Marquis, 2005). At the *Journal of Management Studies*, we take the view that for research to be impactful, it must first of all uncover and explain phenomena responsibly – that is, in a rigorous and reliable way. However, for a study to be published in *JMS*, we require that scholars produce research that is not only

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

theoretically insightful, novel, original, and interesting, but also impactful to managers and society. One approach to conducting impactful research is to develop problem- or phenomenon- driven research directed towards vital and unresolved so-cial, ecological, or ethical concerns, including what some have termed ‘grand challenges’ (Buckley et al., 2017; Davis and Marquis, 2005; George et al., 2016). However, despite a variety of intentions and public commitments such as from the Responsible Research in Business & Management Network (RRBM) and the Academy of Management’s Practice Theme Committee that business school research should be widely appraised for its contribution to societal wellbeing, management and organization studies continue to be criticized for failing to live up to the promise of delivering impactful research (e.g., Davis, 2015; Tourish, 2020; Tsui, 2019). The COVID-19 pandemic, which revealed how deeply organizational practices interact with societal and economic inequality, has intensified these discussions (e.g., Bapuji et al., 2020; Muzio and Doh, 2020).

We use the remainder of this article to explicate five forms of impact that management researchers can aspire to achieve, suggesting ways of addressing each form of impact and inspired by illustrative publications. In each case, we answer the questions ‘what is impact’ in that particular realm, and ‘how can we achieve it’. Importantly, the forms of impact are not discrete or mutually exclusive.

PRACTICAL IMPACT: WHAT IT IS AND HOW TO ACHIEVE IT

Management practice has traditionally been understood as practices narrowly focused on improving the effectiveness of work systems with an eye towards the bottom line. With the advent of critical management studies (e.g., Contu and Willmott, 2005; Fournier and Grey, 2000; Wickert and Schaefer, 2015) and postcolonial studies (e.g., Banerjee, 2000; Prasad, 2003), the conception has broadened to include practices that consider collective welfare and social interests; present possibilities for social transformation; offer opportu-nities for self-management; and question power relationships. As such, opportunities to ‘make a difference’ may emerge when researchers take as a starting point a ‘big question’
worth explaining and the wide range of social actors affected in a multitude of ways by organizations – employees, customers, workers, NGOs, policy makers, social movement actors, non-profits, or government agencies – rather than limit themselves to the nuts and bolts of managerial behaviours (Davis, 2015; Kieser et al., 2015) and performance optimization. Some of these more specific forms of practical impact that focus on so-cial issues and public policy are discussed in the following sections. However, while this broadened definition of management practice offers many more opportunities to do impactful research, it also comes with an increased responsibility to think much more broadly about the audience and stakeholders of our research recommendations.

What is a Practical Application?

According to the online Merriam-Webster dictionary, practical is: ‘of, relating to, or manifested in practice or action: not theoretical or ideal’. It stands to reason that the practical impact of research would refer to research used for actually *doing* (rather than just theorizing or abstracting about) something. It is the ‘what now?’ and is informed by the study’s findings. Practical applications answer the question of ‘*what* do I need *to do* – that I haven’t done so far, or that I need to do more of, less of, or differently – and how do I do it?’. If ‘doing’ and ‘what do to’ are the main thrust of a practical application, it may be helpful, if not mandatory, to engage early in the research design with the practitioners for whom action items are developed and with the stakeholders affected by what may become the practical applications of a study. Below we offer some recommendations for how to do so.

Listen Before You Speak to Understand Conventional Management Practices

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

Seeking to bridge the different spheres that managers and academicians sometimes seem to live on, Baldridge et al. (2004) recommended that 'researchers should study questions that challenge both existing scientific theory and conventional management practice'. which requires researchers to thoroughly understand what theories practitioners use and view as legitimate. This advice is also captured in the Responsible Research in Business and Management's 5th Principle: 'Involving Stakeholders'.

There are several advantages of such an approach, of which we discuss three. First, listening to practitioners creates an opportunity to understand their familiarity with exist-ing research findings on the issue they are experiencing and their openness to new knowl-edge. In some cases, popular theories tend to guide practitioners' thinking long after they have been debunked by scholarly work (Rynes et al., 2002). In other cases, practitioners selectively retain elements of a theory that support their agendas and may be unwilling to engage with evidence that is less supportive of their goals (Eagly, 2016; Ely and Thomas, 2020). Working with practitioners at early stages of a research project creates opportu-nities not only to get input from the people that the study intends to help (Shapiro et al., 2007), but also to educate them about the benefits of ongoing scientific research.

Second, listening to practitioners and stakeholders can create opportunities for developing a mutual understanding of the value of the project for multiple audiences. Practitioners tend to be interested in understanding and solving local issues within their organizations, while researchers seek to produce guidance that applies across firms, industries, and geographies. Engaging in conversation with the intended recipients of a study's practical relevance at the start of a research project creates opportunities for developing a mutual understanding not only of a study's potential practical relevance, but also of the actual problem and its possible root causes (Nicolai et al., 2011). Third, engaging with practitioners and stakeholders may generate opportunities for researchers to collaborate in collecting data. Securing social actors' participation in surveys, focus groups, and experiments has become increasingly difficult (Baruch and Holtom, 2008) and journals are requiring ever more high-quality data in empirical papers (Aguinis and Edwards, 2014). Involving practitioners and stakeholders in research projects can fa-cilitate access to data and thereby greatly reduce the costs and efforts in doing so solo. Taken together, research-practice interactions at the inception of a research project likely 'strengthens the link between the producers and consumers of research'

Connect with Practitioners in Their Conversational Spaces

Managers are unlikely to read every single academic study to extract practical implications and apply them in organizations. Therefore, scholarly articles that operate with an understanding of the knowledge-practice nexus stand to have wider reach among practitioners. In their analysis of the citations of top management journals' studies in practitioner media (e.g., *Financial Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Economist*, *Harvard Business Review*, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, etc.), Birkinshaw et al. (2016) found that the articles most cited in practitioner media were those for which the underlying academic paper itself also cited more articles from practitioner media. This suggests that studies that connect with the research-practice interface have a higher likelihood of being deemed practically relevant.

Among the scholarly work most often cited in journals that communicate with practitioners, review papers stand out, perhaps because they synthesize and organize ideas around a particular phenomenon or issue, serving as a reference and source for further reading (Birkinshaw et al., 2016). Since review articles also present unique opportunities for making a theoretical contribution, as *JMS'* recently published editorial explains (Post et al., 2020), they seem an ideal form of scholarly research for bridging the research-prac-tice gap (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2020; Elsbach and van Knippenberg, 2020).

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

Research can be made more practical when it provides information on how the study's stakeholders can go about implementing its recommendations or heeding its implications. Studies that effectively do so communicate the basic, underlying principle from their findings and describe how it may be applied in one or two different and recognizable circumstances or to various groups of individuals. For example, Huettermann and Bruch (2019, p. 1055–65) communicate a big picture recommendation ('HHRM should incorporate HR practices that focus on both prevention of and recovery from psycho-logical illnesses, that are targeted at both employees and leaders, that receive support from the organization's top management, and that are constantly evaluated') that is easy to comprehend conceptually. They then provide additional details (e.g., highlighting not only the role of leaders but specifically of transformational leadership, and supporting their recommendation with research showing such leadership style can be learned).

Studies can also develop theory by striving for more actionable knowledge when they recognize what already exists and develop new scales, interventions, or frameworks. For example, Nishii (2013) recognized that despite the growing corporate awareness of the potential benefits of inclusion for leveraging an organization's diversity, the field lacked a scientifically validated tool for measuring a firm's climate for inclusion. She went on to develop one in a study published in *Academy of Management Journal*. Further, research findings can be shared with freely accessible organizational platforms on a given theme or grand challenge (Eagly, 2016). For example, Harvard's gender action portal, 'a collection of research evaluating the impact of specific policies, strategies, and organizational practices to advance gender equity', highlights findings from field and laboratory experimental studies in a variety of disciplines that evaluate gender policies.

Finally, the dissemination of research findings need not be limited to the scientific journals in a field but can be further elaborated upon and made more broadly available as a publi-cation in a practitioner journal. For example, Wickert and de Bakker (2018) take a two-step approach in making a practical impact. In their study of how CSR managers – framed as social-issue sellers – create momentum for CSR inside large organizations, they argue that issue selling is to be understood as a relational Endeavour between buyers and sellers and in doing so first and foremost makes a theoretical contribution to the issue-selling literature. Then, they condense the practical aspects of their findings into a short essay published in *Harvard Business Review* (Wickert and de Bakker, 2019), in which they describe four tactics that CSR managers can use to inspire other leaders to act on sustainability issues. What is important to note here is that a solid methodologically robust and theoretically sound base is important as a foundation upon which to then expand something more 'hands on'.

At *JMS*, we see this two-step approach to making a practical impact as a promising way forward. Because of this, we have launched www.managementstudiesinsights.com, the official blog of the *Journal of Management Studies*. The blog provides *JMS* authors the unique opportunity to compose short essays that address the importance and impact of their research beyond the theoretical contributions that are at the core of their scholarly work. In doing so, scholars can not only demonstrate the practical impact of their re-search, but also address how findings may have other forms of societal, policy, or educational impact as we will discuss further down.

Be Responsible

Observing that 'academics tend to ignore the details when they prescribe – prescribing being a consequence of describing and theorizing – and those details can be terribly consequential to ordinary citizens in their daily lives', Wright and Phan (2017, p. 1) exhort researchers to exert care and tread responsibly in their recommendations, because they may have unintended consequences on a range of stakeholders, including research subjects or

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

participating organizations (6th principle of response research), and especially on topics that are subject to advocacy. Perhaps the most widely cited research that has had perverse implications has been Milton Friedman's shareholder primacy framework.

To summarize, listening to and conversing with practitioners offers many opportunities for developing impactful research and contributing actionable and responsible knowledge that together can help 'make a difference'.

SOCIETAL IMPACT: TACKLING GRAND CHALLENGES LARGE AND SMALL

As noted in the introduction, there have been increasing calls for business and man-agement scholars to contribute more substantially to broader societal concerns. These include, *inter alia*, social, ecological, and ethical concerns within which there are myriad specific issues such as disruption from climate change, inequality, and employment security as well as more abstract but nonetheless important conditions such as wellbeing, happiness, and life quality based on intact ecological conditions. There is, therefore, natural overlap between societal impact and other types of impact, especially policy, in those governmental policies – and in some cases corporate actions – are often designed to address societal issues. Hence, societal impact may be as much about identification, edification, and information as it is about changed behavior or practice.

One reason management scholars may not be more active in addressing these broad societal issues is that they are quite 'messy' to research. In particular, some of these issues – especially the 'grand challenges' that we referenced above – are phenomenon-driven; often require multi- or interdisciplinary approaches; unfold at multiple levels of analysis, and therefore require multi-level methods; and involve complex interdependencies among business, government, and society in the global environment (Buckley et al., 2017). It should be noted, however, that these rather abstract societal issues also materialize at many local and micro levels, such as public health disparities in a specific municipal district, hazardous waste disposal in a particular community, or racial discrimination in a housing complex. As we will argue below, tackling more specific manifestations of these broader issues is one effective way of restricting the scope of research such that it is more manageable and actionable.

Disaggregate Broad Issues into Component Parts by Building Specific Theories That Can Contribute to General Ones

Another strategy to delimit the scope of research on a broad societal issue is to disaggregate those issues into component parts and focus on a subset of the broader one. This approach allows for the development of special or idiosyncratic theoretical perspectives that are 'nested' within a general theory. Buckley et al. (2017) describe this process as (1) identifying key empirical questions that require explanation; (2) constructing a general theory; (3) acknowledging that within the general theory reside nested special theories, where the general theory can be tested at a given time in a given arena ('context'); and (4) confronting the special theory with the empirical evidence.

Several articles in a *JMS* special issue on political CSR demonstrate how addressing specific manifestations of a broad issue can help delimit the scope of research and allow for examination of specific theories that can then be applied more broadly. One of these, which won the *JMS* Best Paper Award for 2016, focuses on a subcomponent of a broader issue (in this case a social movement around sustainable coffee standards) by exploring the interactions of specific civil society and corporate organizations and actors involved in that movement (Levy et al., 2016). The authors show how 'dynamics of moves and accommodations between challengers and corporate actors shape the practice and meaning of "sustainable" coffee' (Levy et al., 2016, p. 364).

Another article in that special issue explored fracking in the Canadian province of Quebec and the use of justification and forms of power by government, industry, and societal actors

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

as tools to gain moral legitimacy in debates over the issue (Gond et al., 2016), while another explores the 'conflict minerals' movement and its implications for mining in the Democratic Republic of Congo, presenting a model of corporate polit-ical responsibility that tracks how the responsibility for a grand challenge shifts from governmental to private actors (Reinecke and Ansari, 2016). In each of these three con-tributions, scholars focus on a specific context (geographic or sector-specific) in which a global-scale issue plays out, use longitudinal methods to document the changing role and responsibilities of different actors in relation to the problem, and integrate and build new theory that can then be more broadly applied to the wider phenomenon or issue.

Consider Alternate Article Formats

As noted in our discussion of practical impact, scholars might view their effort to contribute to societal impact as a multi-step process. Having a conceptually deep understanding of the societal problem is a necessary first step, and this step is typically encapsulated in a scholarly publication. A subsequent step is to translate the research findings into some more actionable format or encourage others to do so. As such, contributions to societal impact might be evidenced by translations into more accessible outlets, media mentions, and in some cases direct influence on stakeholder approaches and strategies.

In addition to the examples of alternative outlets we discussed in the practical impact section, many academic journals feature non-traditional article formats such as perspectives papers, point-counterpoint exchanges, essays, and commentaries that provide for a more flexible format than traditional theory-development and theory-testing contributions. As one illustration, *JMS* is publishing nearly three dozen short commentaries from scholars on COVID-19 and its implications for management and organization theory.[3]

Another illustrative case is represented by the 2005 point-counterpoint exchange focused on the then-growing attention to – and concern about – the social, economic, and political implications of offshore outsourcing. In that exchange, Farrell (2005), then the head of the McKinsey consulting firm's global institute, offers an assertive defense of off-shoring as a legitimate and appropriate business strategy. Levy (2005), in contrast, presents an equally powerful counterpoint about the potential disruptions associated with the phenomenon and the implications for the global political economy, while Doh (2005) offers a third perspective that seeks to find some common ground while considering both ethical and strategic implications.

Jeffrey Pfeffer's provocative 2016 essay in a section *JMS* calls '*JMS Says*' is an illus-tration of the flexibility of the essay format. In it, he offers a biting indictment of the moral and ethical distortions that emanate from the celebrity status accorded to wealthy, successful executives who concurrently oversee 'hellish and toxic work arrangements' (Pfeffer, 2016, p. 663). He documents the psychological mechanisms through which in-dividuals rationalize these arrangements, and skewers management and organizational scholarship as being complicit in the process. Clearly, such a contribution could be published only in one of these alternate formats.

In sum, we urge management and organizational scholars to continue and enhance their contributions to important societal issues and constituencies. They can do so by focusing on important topics with societal relevance; delimiting and disaggregating the scope of research to focus on a narrower set of organizations and actors and building theory around a specific case that can then be generalized to a broader context; and seeking alternate outlets and journal article formats and organizing or contributing to special issues.

PUBLIC POLICY IMPACT: FOUNDATIONS, STRATEGIES, AND MECHANISMS

Firms headquartered in California must have at least two women on their boards by 2021 (Stewart, 2018). Washington state requires 25 per cent female board representation.

By 2021 (Shukovsky, 2020). Similar legislation is underway or in discussion in other states in the USA (Green et al., 2019). In Europe, EU policies mandate that companies' female board representation exceed 40 per cent (Zillman, 2017). Governments justify such poli-cies not just on social justice grounds, but also by invoking the potential financial value of adding women to boards (e.g., Comptroller, 2019). Without understanding the conditions required for diversity to improve or harm firm performance and the effects of quotas on their beneficiaries – topics that have generated a large body of research – governments may well increase female representation on corporate boards while also contributing to the problems women face in these circles (Post et al., forthcoming).

This is not a unique case where management scholarship could provide a deeper understanding of important policy issues among political decision-makers. However, for a variety of historical reasons, management studies scholars and policy makers rarely engage with each other. This is surprising, because the infusion of social science research into the public policy arena was made already in the 1960s (Coleman, 1966). Despite the centrality of social sciences – including 'social psychology, behavioral economics, deci-sion theory, and organizational sociology' (p. 5) among others – in explaining 'when, why, how, [and] even whether science is used in [and impacts] public policy making' (Prewitt et al., 2012, p. 5), management scholarship in particular has, unlike economics, largely ignored questions of public policy.

There are, however, positive signs of growing interest in impacting public policy among editors of business and management journals, such as the *Academy of Management Perspectives* (Gong et al., 2019) and *Business Horizons* (Fisher, 2020). Likewise, as noted in the previous section, the scholarly communities studying sustainability, corporate social responsibility, the changing nature of work, diversity, and most recently COVID-19 increasingly question if and how their research impacts not only business but also public policy. One might even be as bold to say that scholars in these and other areas implicitly, if not explicitly, advocate for public policy action particularly in their theoretical and management implications sections, as evidenced, for instance, in research about the re-turn of government in private regulation of global governance issues (Kourula et al., 2019). As a point of departure, the purpose of this section is twofold. First, since many of us have not been trained in public policy, we provide an overview of two central themes in public policy science. Then, we propose a framework for how management studies scholars can systematically impact public policy.

Impacting Public Policy: The Advocacy, Control, and Ethics (ACE) Framework

If 'the primary goal of policy makers is a practical response to a particular public policy issue' (Prewitt et al., 2012, p. 42), then management scholars would benefit from a frame-work for how to impact public policy issues congruent with the philosophical foundations of public policy and with awareness of the challenges of evidence-influenced politics. We propose an advocacy, control, ethics (ACE) framework as a guide for how management scholars can impact public policy. The ACE framework can also be applied to organizational policy. We encourage scholars to either bake the framework into their research question and study design or develop a public policy subsection in the Discussion Section of their paper. Impacting public policy based on the ACE framework includes adopting three stances.

Advocate for Your Policy Position

Advocacy is 'the act or process of supporting a cause or proposal' (Merriam-Webster Online, 2020) with the goal of impacting public-policy decisions. While advocacy has a role in predicting and explaining outcomes and consequences, it is fundamentally nor-mative as advocacy and its policy argument mechanism puts values in motion. Therefore, paradoxically, while policy arguments 'should be based on evidence-based discourse'

(Gong et al., 2019, p. 133), they are infused with values and thus better characterized as evidence-influenced politics.

Advocacy encourages scholars to engage 'in personally relevant research, defined as research that addresses questions in which scholars are personally invested or involves a population to which they belong or in which they hold a personal interest' (Jones and Bartunek, 2020, p. 2). Personally relevant research challenges the assumption that a lack of professional distance undermines research 'quality'. Rather, it helps address the two-communities metaphor (Caplan, 1979) characterizing differences between pub-lic-policy makers and scientists. Personally relevant research enables 'scholars to ask more relevant questions, access otherwise hard-to-reach populations, and make import-ant connections, leading to theories that reflect the breadth of organizational phenomena present in an increasingly diverse world' (Jones and Bartunek, 2020, p. 4). One of the major benefits of reducing the distance between the two communities is that when advocating for their policy argument, social scientists can use the language and trade craft of policy makers, a key success factor for impacting public policy. For example, many scholars partner with activist organizations who rally for causes that they also personally consider important. This can be one fruitful way to bridge scholarship and advocacy, because such organizations typically possess a closer linkage to policy makers than many researchers (Holmes, 2019). The study by Reinecke and Donaghey (2020), al-luded to earlier, of working conditions in textile factories in Bangladesh is a case in point. The authors aim to advocate for policy changes in an indirect way, as their work yields implications for NGOs and labour unions who seek to collaborate with governments to improve labour rights of affected workers in the context under study.

Choose Policy Instruments to Control Thinking, Behavior, or Performance

Control is the 'power to influence or command thought, opinion, or behavior' (Merriam-Webster, 2020). Applied to public policy, scholars advocate not only for a specific policy (e.g., living wage), changes to an existing policy (e.g., family leave policy), or the public policy process (e.g., transparency in the policy cycle), but for its implementation. A mechanism of public-policy control is the policy instrument, covering the spectrum from wait-and-see to information-based, expenditure-based, regulation, and finally direct government action (Mackey and Shaxton, 2011). Policy instruments are courses of action available to the government to implement policy objectives (Mackey and Shaxton, 2011). For scholars seeking to impact public policy, two control-related questions are particularly relevant: which policy instrument(s) to select to achieve a policy goal, and to what extent should the policy instruments be applied universally or dependent on context.

Policy instruments cover the spectrum from wait-and-see to coercion. The least coer-cive instruments are information-based with the objective of influencing organizations and people through knowledge transfer, communications, or moral persuasion (e.g., washing hands prevents the spread of disease). Expenditure-based instruments provide money or other monetary-related incentives (e.g., grants, loans, opportunity-zone tax incentives to encourage investment in low income communities, vouchers) to achieve policy objectives. Regulation is considered to be the most commonly used instrument to define norms (the range of acceptable behavior) or prohibit activities. Finally, governments can act directly, often via taxation, to provide services to achieve a policy objective (e.g., National Parks, infrastructure, education) (Mackey and Shaxton, 2011).

The work of Porter and colleagues (2019, p. 277) is a notable example of how management research can address issues relevant for policy makers. The authors argue that 'policymakers observe that global climate policy misses the crucial consideration of specific local, social and environmental conditions'. In consequence, their study suggests crowd-sourcing as an effective policy instrument that politicians can leverage when addressing

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

climate change at the local level. Furthermore, their work underscores the importance of co-creation of knowledge among multiple stakeholders including governments in order to effectively tackle global environmental problems.

Assess Policy Paradoxes to Reveal Ethical Concerns

Public policy has a consequence orientation. Thus, whether there should be a policy for a societal or economic problem and 'if so, what the policy ought to be are fundamentally ethical questions' (Cochran and Malone, 2014, p. 17). Surfacing ethical concerns inher-ent in all policy recommendations and their associated policy instruments is part of our responsibility. One mechanism for surfacing ethical concerns is the assessment of policy paradoxes.

Stone coined the term 'policy paradox' to recognize that it is possible to define the same policy problem and the criteria for success in contradictory ways, noting that 'par-adoxes are nothing but trouble… and political life is full of them' (Stone, 2012, p. 2). For example, during the coronavirus pandemic, in-class schooling is both safe and unsafe (depending on how the problem and criteria for success are defined). The policy paradox is not limited to dynamics between rival policy camps. Because politicians have policy goals as well as political goals, they are motivated to frame policy problems in multiple ways and shuffle outcome criteria allowing them to claim policy success and failure. We suggest that scholars and policy makers that craft a policy argument and its instruments in ways that accommodate and acknowledge its public-policy paradoxes are more likely to impact public policy (good and bad).

We are optimistic that management studies scholars have or can develop toolkits to wade into policy debates. Public policy is a contiguous field of study (Dubin, 1978) to management studies. While there are important differences, the theories and methods of public policy based in the social sciences are accessible to management study scholars. In this respect, we agree with Gong and colleagues (2019) that 'the most vexing, and in-teresting, questions occupy the boundaries between disciplines, and they usually remain unasked' (p. 133). By moving into the public-policy lane, management studies can 'ask the unasked'.

EDUCATIONAL IMPACT: EXPLORING AND PRACTICING THE RESEARCH–TEACHING NEXUS

The Humboldtian Model: Shape Educational Learning Paths Through Your Research

Humboldt's ideas on academic education – that research and teaching are to be inti-mately related, with the former leading the latter – offer a powerful background for discussing the educational impact of research. The starting point of the discussion is the *research–teaching nexus*, which rests on the notion that students – and therefore graduates – are the first conduits whereby universities make impact on society at large, and that good education is fundamentally based on state-of-the-art research.

In the Classroom, Apply Your Research to Lead Students Towards the Knowledge Frontiers

To explain how research might impact education, Healey and Jenkins (2009) developed a model that captures the complexity of the research–teaching nexus. Their model builds on two dimensions: (i) the extent of students' involvement in the classroom environment, that is, as audience or as participants; (ii) the extent to which in-class teaching empha-sizes research content or research processes and problems. Based on these dimensions, the model identifies four opportunities to make research more educationally impactful:

Junior scholars may wish to try out initiatives across the four approaches to balance students' engagement, bearing in mind that different disciplines may lend themselves differently to such approaches. Ideally, the appropriate balance should be seen across the

ISSN: 2278-4632
Vol-11 Issue-01 March 2021

four approaches as well as within and along the entire students' curriculum: scholars' initiatives ought to be, therefore, coordinated with the programme's director.

The *research-led* approach sees students as audience and emphasises research as content. Initiatives informed by this approach are useful starting points for junior scholars to make their research more impactful on students' education. Translating qualitative research into case studies and involving the case's actors in class discussion constitutes an example to generate educational impact based on one's own research. Additionally, designing and teaching elective courses based on new research material such as a collection of journal articles published around one of the societal grand challenges we highlighted above or consolidating them into a new textbook may represent another way to bring research into the classroom.

The *research-oriented* approach is archetypical for PhD classrooms that may also be used in undergraduate teaching to broaden the perimeter of the educational impact of re-search. Whereas students are seen as audience, in the research-oriented approach the emphasis is on 'research as a process' with the aim to equip students with research tools and methods. Understanding and acquiring such tools and methods enable students to move closer to academic research: especially in the so-called post-truth era, students armed with such tools are able to recognize and appreciate academic research, and therefore gain an advantageous stance to tease out and distinguish information from disinformation, news from fake news. Additionally, acquiring research tools and methods offers students and future graduates innovative interpretative lenses of the real world.

Aim Towards a Research-Based Approach in Your Research-Teaching Nexus

Within the *research-tutored* approach, students' engagement evolves from audience to par-ticipant. Review articles are a powerful tool for bringing research into the classroom: they make it easy for someone not knowledgeable about a topic to quickly get up to speed (see e.g., Post et al., 2020).

The *research-based* approach switches the emphasis from 'research as a product', i.e., the research results, to 'research as a process', i.e., the methods and routes that lead to the generation of new knowledge. The research-based approach focuses on how research is done. Here, students learn through an enquiry-based, research-like process: this is a chal-lenging approach as it requires the design and implementation of laboratories, courses, and modules that contemplate the involvement of students in the process of knowledge production. In a research-based setting, students become actor in the process of gener-ating knowledge. According to Fung (2017), involving students in the generation and shaping of new knowledge enables them to learn to experiment and challenge received concepts, to promote curiosity, and to develop and demonstrate real independence of thought. This latter aim is akin to the idea of Von Humboldt that students should be-come autonomous world citizens by developing their own reasoning powers and intellec-tual aptitude. Clearly, research – its content and process of inquiry – holds promise for making an impact on education.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this editorial was to outline and discuss how management and organi-zation scholars might meet the intensifying pressures to produce societally useful and impactful research. To that effect, we highlighted five forms of impact – *scholarly*, *practical*, *policy*, *societal*, and *educational* – and suggested steps for achieving each form of impact. Although we have discussed these five areas somewhat discretely, we believe that it is not only possible but appropriate for scholars to seek to achieve impact across several of these areas. Indeed, we have illustrated how impact in one domain can be extended to others and how writing for one audience can stimulate thinking and reflection that results in contributions to others.

The academic enterprise is and should be one of combination, connection, integration, and ultimately, unification. While we have described several distinct pathways through which management scholars can achieve impact in a way that is perhaps broader and more expansive than traditionally thought, it is important to acknowledge the interde-pendence of these channels and here we wish to underscore those interconnections and complementarities. For example, it is not uncommon for scholars to begin with theoret-ical intuitions or anecdotal phenomenological observations that then generate research questions answered through a formal empirical model. That model, in turn, might be informed by additional practical observations and insights, some of which may have policy or societal implications. A research article derived from these insights may be summarized in a practitioner or policy outlet, or be incorporated into a textbook or other pedagogical product. It is through this iterative, reflexive, and combinative process that scholarship can generate impact across multiple realms and speak to a diverse set of stakeholders.

By providing concrete suggestions for how to reflect on, formulate, and contribute to these various forms of impact, we hope to have motivated management and orga-nization scholars to think more broadly about the opportunities for making an impact with their research. While *JMS* still primarily publishes scholarly impactful research, we encourage contributions that have the potential for reaching broader audiences and making a real difference to the range of relevant stakeholders. Producing impactful re-search, however, is not the sole responsibility of authors. Rather, it is a collaborative effort and the responsibility of the entire scholarly community. We as editors at *JMS* seek to advance such research despite the challenges associated with conducting and evaluating it, because we believe that impactful research not only gives a new sense of meaning to scholars, but can also make an important contribution to improve societal conditions based on scientific evidence.

REFERENCE

Aguinis, H. and Edwards, J. R. (2014). ‘Methodological wishes for the next decade and how to make wishes come true’. *Journal of Management Studies*, **51**, 143–74.

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., Alabduljader, N., Bailey, J. R. and Lee, J. (2019). ‘A pluralist conceptualization of scholarly impact in management education: Students as stakeholders’. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **18**, 11–42.

Alvesson, M. and Gabriel, Y. (2013). ‘Beyond formulaic research. In praise of greater diversity in organiza-tional research and publications’. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **12**, 245–63.

Alvesson, M. and Sandberg, J. (2011). ‘Generating research questions through problematization’. *Academy of Management Review*, **36**, 247–71.

Alvesson, M. and Sandberg, J. (2020). ‘The problematizing review: A counterpoint to Elsbach and Van Knippenberg’s argument for integrative reviews’. *Journal of Management Studies*, **57** 1290–1304.

Ansari, S., Munir, K. and Gregg, T. (2012). ‘Impact at the “bottom of the pyramid”: The role of social capi-tal in capability development and community empowerment’. *Journal of Management Studies*, **49**, 813–42.

Anyebe, A. (2018). ‘An overview of approaches to the study of public policy’. *International Journal of Political Science*, **4**, 8–17.

Arslan, B. and Tarakci, M. (2020). ‘Negative spillovers across partnerships for responsible innovation: Evidence from the 2014 Ebola outbreak’. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/ joms.12607

Bacharach, S. B. (1989). ‘Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation’. *Academy of Management Review*, **14**, 496–515.

Baldridge, D. C., Floyd, S. W. and Markóczy, L. (2004). 'Are managers from Mars and academicians from Venus? Toward an understanding of the relationship between academic quality and practical rele-vance'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **25**, 1063–74.
Banerjee, S. B. (2000). 'Whose land is it anyway? National interest, indigenous stakeholders, and colonial discourses: The case of the Jabiluka uranium mine'. *Organization & Environment*, **13**, 3–38.
Bapuji, H., Patel, C., Ertug, G. and Allen, D. G. (2020). 'Corona crisis and inequality: Why management research needs a societal turn'. *Journal of Management*, **46**, 1205–22.
Bartunek, J. M. and Rynes, S. L. (2010). 'The construction and contribution of implications for practice:
What's in them and what might they offer?'. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, **9**, 100–17.
Baruch, Y. and Holtom, B. C. (2008). 'Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research'.
Human Relations, **61**, 1139–60.
Birkinshaw, J., Lecuona, R. and Barwise, P. (2016). 'The relevance gap in business school research: Which academic papers are cited in managerial bridge journals?'. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **15**, 686–702.
Bothello, J. and Roulet, T. J. (2019). 'The imposter syndrome, or the mis-representation of self in academic life'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **56**, 854–61.
Buckley, P. O., Doh, J. P. and Benischke, M. (2017). 'Towards a renaissance in international business re-search? Big questions, grand challenges, and the future of IB scholarship'. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **48**, 1045–64.
Caplan, N. (1979). 'The two communities theory and knowledge utilization'. *American Behavioral Scientist*, **22**, 459–70.
Chowdhury, R. (2020). 'The mobilization of noncooperative spaces: Reflections from Rohingya refugee camps'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12612
Cochran, C. and Malone, E. (2014). *Public Policy: Perspectives and Choices*, 5th edition. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.
Contu, A. and Willmott, H. (2005). 'You spin me round: The realist turn in organization and management studies'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **42**, 1645–62.
Corley, K. G. and Gioia, D. A. (2011). 'Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution?'. *Academy of Management Review*, **36**, 12–32.
Cornelissen, J. P. and Durand, R. (2014). 'Moving forward: Developing theoretical contributions in manage-ment studies'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **51**, 995–1022.
Daft, R. (1995). 'Why I recommended that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it'. In Cummings, L. and Frost, P. (Eds), *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences* (pp. 164–182). London: Sage.
Davis, G. F. (2015). 'Celebrating organization theory: The after-party'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **52**, 309–19.
Davis, G. F. and Marquis, C. (2005). 'Prospects for organization theory in the early twenty-first century:
Institutional fields and mechanisms'. *Organization Science*, **16**, 332–43.
Doh, J. P. (2005). 'Offshore outsourcing: Implications for international business and strategic management theory and practice'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **42**, 695–704.
Doh, J. P. (2016). 'From the editor: Why we need phenomenon-based research in international business'.

Journal of World Business, **50**, 609–11.
Dubin, R. (1978). *Theory Building*, Revised edition. New York: Free Press.
Dunn, W. (2019). *Pragmatism and the Origins of the Policy Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Eagly, A. H. (2016). 'When passionate advocates meet research on diversity, does the honest broker stand a
chance?'. *Journal of Social Issues*, **72**, 199–222.
Elsbach, K. D. and van Knippenberg, D. (2020). 'Creating high-impact literature reviews: An argument for "integrative reviews"'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **57**, 1277–1289.
Ely, R. and Thomas, D. (2020). 'Getting serious about diversity: Enough already with the business case'.
Harvard Business Review, November-December issue.
Espeland, W. N. (2015). 'Noticing numbers: How quantification changes what we see and what we don't'. In Kornberger, M., Justesen, L., Madsen, A. K. and Mouritsen, J. (Eds), *Making Things Valuable* (pp. 18–36). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Farrell, D. (2005). 'Offshoring: Value creation through economic change'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **42**, 675–83.
Fisher, G. (2020). 'High-quality submissions'. *Business Horizons*, **63**, 249–51.
Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (2000). 'At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies'. *Human Relations*, **53**, 7–32.
Fung, D. (2017). *A connected curriculum for higher education*. London: UCL Press.
George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A. and Tihanyi, L. (2016). 'Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **59**, 1880–95.
Gill, M. J. (2020). 'High flying business schools: Working together to address the impact of management ed-ucation and research on climate change'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/ joms.12575
Gond, J.-P., Barin Cruz, L., Raufflet, E. and Charron, M. (2016). 'To frack or not to frack? The interaction of justification and power in a sustainability controversy'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **53**, 330–63.
Gong, Y., Khavul, S., Markman, G., Mors, M., Phan, P., Toker, S., Wiersema, M. and Wood, G. (2019). 'From the editors: Editorial reflections on academy of management perspectives' revised editorial mis-sion'. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **33**, 131–33.